

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office.

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Ε 101327-126 SINOFSKY 08/25/99 09/382,615 EXAMINER QM32/0713 021125 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON MA 02110 3739 DATE MAILED: This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Responsive to communication filed on May 7, 200/ This action is made final. This application has been examined A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____3__month(s), ___ ____ days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part 1 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. 3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. L Claims / 2 イ _ are pending in the application. Of the above, claims_ 2. Claims have been cancelled. a. Claims 4. Claims 1-27 5. Claims are objected to. 6. Claims ___ are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _ . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are 🛘 acceptable; 🗖 not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _______ has (have) been _____approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed 12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received Deen filed in parent application, serial no. ___ ____; filed on _ 13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

PTOL-326 (Rev. 2/93)

Art Unit: 3739

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the control handle must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 9, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, it is unclear which of the structures recited in claim 1 the second tubular structure is to be concentric with. In claim 9 the meaning of "section in" is unclear. It is unclear what further manipulative step is intended to be claimed by reciting properties of the elongate member.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 9, 15, 17-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kittrell et al.

See figures 4, 4A, 13A-F and the specification related thereto.

Art Unit: 3739

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Isner et al.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sameson et al.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kittrell et al in combination with Heaven. Kittrell et al teach a device as claimed except for the

particular deflection member. Heaven teaches a deflection member (see figure 1) which has a cut out and, when viewed in profile, an hour glass shape wherein the width of the cut

away portion is less than the diameter of the non-cut away portion. It would have been obvious

to employ the deflection member of Heaven in the device of Kittrell et al, since Kittrell et al

envision a wide variety of deflection mechanisms, and to form the deflection member so as to

run from the proximal end the catheter, since this would provide greater strength, as shown by

Heaven, thereby rendering the cutout the distal end of the deflection member, and to form the

member or surround the member with a fluoropolymer, since these are notorious for use in

catheters and provide a lubricious surface, official notice of which is hereby taken, and to

Application/Control Number: 09/382,615

Art Unit: 3739

provide the particular location of the cutout, since this is not critical and provides no unexpected

result, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittrell

et al in combination with Heaven as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of

.Vassiliadis et al. Vassilidis et al teach the use of gold coating on a laser applicator. It would

have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ a gold coating, as taught by

Vassiliadis, since this would protect tissue from unintended irradiation, thus producing a device

such as claimed.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samson et al in

combination with Kittrell et al. Samson et al teach a method such as claimed except for the

meaning and controlling steps and the use of a slideable conductor. Kittrell et al teach the

equivalence of slideable and fixed conductors and the desirability of measuring reflected light

and controlling the energy based on that, thus it would have been obvious to employ the

particular laser ablation method of Kittrell et al in the method of Samson et al, since Samson et

al give no particulars of the laser ablation method, thus producing a method such as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to David Shay at

telephone number (703) 308-2215.

David Shay:bhw

July 5, 2001

DAVID M. SHAY

Page 4

GROUP 330